

THE



SENTINEL OF LIBERTY

"If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not."—Jesus Christ.

VOLUME 15.

CHICAGO, JULY 26, 1900.

NUMBER 29.

THE SENTINEL OF LIBERTY.

(Continuing American Sentinel)

Published weekly at 324 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois,

BY THE

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

Entered at the Chicago Post Office as Second-Class Matter.

Subscription price, - - - - \$1.00

L. A. SMITH, }
C. P. BOLLMAN, } - - - - Editors.

Civil government does not derive its authority from any people's opinions respecting the will of God, however conscientiously held.

The Chinese are very patriotic; but the true patriotism is that which is not narrowed down to the interests of self, or of country, but seeks the highest welfare of mankind.

The "Christian" nations cry for vengeance upon China; but Christianity seeks no vengeance save to heap "coals of fire" on the heads of evil men by acts of kindness; it lifts no sword save the "sword of the Spirit."

To prove that Sunday laws are right, it is usually necessary for clergymen to pose as statesmen and physicians, prescribing for the welfare of the state and the health of the human body. This would better be left to the real statesmen and the doctors.

If any act ought to be prohibited by civil law, it ought to be prohibited to all alike. To permit such an

act by a portion of the community, because "conscientiously" done, is a confession that it belongs to the domain of morals, and is not a proper subject of civil legislation.

You are not doing the work of Jesus Christ unless you are setting men at liberty (Isa. 61:1), and you cannot do this by seeking their arrest under Sunday laws.

If any act does not infringe the equal rights of others, the state has no right to prohibit it, however morally wrong it may be.

Bad Advice from an English Clergyman.

The following press item of news from the Christian Endeavor convention now in session in London, is brief but pithy:

"Dr. Parker of the City Temple urged American Christian Endeavorers to nominate the Rev. Francis E. Clark and the Rev. Charles M. Sheldon for the highest offices in the United States, as Christian men should be at the head of things."

It is true enough that "Christian men should be at the head of things," but to do this they do not need to get out of the work to which God has appointed them. Indeed, they cannot be "at the head of things" in the nation unless they stay in the place to which Christianity has led them and let the affairs of the world alone.

God is "at the head of things," and God is in his church; therefore the Christian church is at the head of things, so long as she maintains her union with the Lord. The Christian church points the way of true progress in all that makes for the betterment of mankind. So all sincere professors of Christianity must believe. In every respect the Christian church should

be far in advance of the un-Christian world. She should be "at the head of things" in the highest and truest sense.

Therefore let "Father" Clark and the Rev. Mr. Sheldon stay where they are. As preachers of the gospel they do well; and it would be a degradation to set them in the seat of the politician. And besides, what do they know about the administration of political office? What does Christianity teach about politics? How does it qualify anyone for political excellence? The Christian in political office would have sincerity and good motives; but he might make the greatest failure in running the affairs of state, for all that. And as a matter of fact, and a matter of history, no person of deep religious fervor was ever an eminent statesman. Oliver Cromwell may be instanced as an exception; but who desires to have the statesmanship of Cromwell exemplified in the United States? Consider for example such men as Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, Jackson, and others eminent in the political history of this country; none of them were conspicuous as church men, while some of the most eminent, as Jefferson and Lincoln, seem not to have belonged to any church. On the other hand history shows with equal plainness that whenever the affairs of state were run by the church leaders, in any country, civil government became destructive of the very things it was meant to preserve. Civil and religious freedom were invaded and a barrier was erected across the pathway of mental and moral progress. The worst persecutions that have darkened history were waged by church leaders in command of the civil power. They were sincere men, and their motive was to do God service; but the results of their efforts at statecraft were such as it may well be hoped will not be repeated at this day.

Let Christians stick to their calling as ambassadors of Christ, and let politics be run by the politicians. Dr. Parker has said many good things about church and state, but his business, and that of every clergyman, is to call men up from the world to the higher plane of Christianity, and not down from the plane of Christianity to the level of the world. s.

Every clause in every Sunday law in all the world, that exempts those "who conscientiously believe in and who actually observe as a Sabbath a day other than Sunday," is a confession that such legislation is an invasion of the rights of conscience.

Every such exemption is a confession that the keeping of a Sabbath is a religious act; which to be of any value must be done conscientiously, and should not therefore be enforced by the state.

No statute against murder, or theft, or assault, or arson, or slander ever contains a clause exempting

from its penalty those who may do any one or all of those things "conscientiously."

And why do not laws against murder, theft, etc., contain clauses exempting from their penalties those who violate them "conscientiously?" Simply because they are purely civil, entirely outside the domain of conscience, and are designed for the protection, not of creeds, cults, or dogmas, but of men.

You have a right to observe the Sabbath, but not at the expense of some one else.

Is the Church Christian?

This question is discussed by Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow in the Social Forum for July. After stating the question Mr. Bigelow says:

"That depends upon our standard. What is the meaning of the term Christian? Can a church be Christian and sanction war? Can a Christian church remain indifferent to the menace of monopoly? Is a church Christian that seeks to cultivate the private virtues to the exclusion of civic righteousness and social justice? Is that church Christian which is reconciled to poverty, which, by practice if not by precept, preaches, 'Masters, be kind to your slaves. Slaves, obey your masters and keep sober?' * * *

"It is the business of the church to save the world, not to rescue souls from the world. It is the business of the church to redeem, not men, but man."

In the next to the last sentence in this quotation is contained THE error of National Reform under whatever guise it may be found. It is just exactly the business of the church to rescue souls from the world. That is just what Christ did when here upon earth, and it is just what he commissioned his followers to do after he returned to heaven; and he promised that in the doing of this he would be with them "even unto the end of the world."

Said the Saviour to his disciples, "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." John 15:19. And again, in his prayer to the Father, Jesus said of his disciples: "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." John 17:16.

Inspiration very clearly differentiates between the world and the individuals that by the gospel are taken out of the world. Says the apostle John, "The world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." 1 John 2:17.

In Acts 15:14 we are plainly told that God's purpose in visiting the Gentiles is "to take out of them a people for his name." This is exactly in harmony with Paul's testimony in the eleventh chapter of his letter to the Romans, wherein he likens Israel to an olive tree, and the individuals to branches. The tree survives, but branches—individuals—are separated

from it; and branches—individuals—are taken from the wild olive tree—from among the Gentiles—and become a part of the tame olive tree, partaking of its “root and fatness,” contrary to nature; since in natural grafting the fruit produced is not that of the root, but that of the scion.

In his zeal to arraign the church for its shortcomings Mr. Bigelow inveighs even against the New Testament itself. The New Testament is certainly Christian. If it is not we have no standard by which to determine what Christianity is.

The Apostle Paul taught masters to be kind to their slaves, and slaves to obey their masters. He even sent Onesimus, an escaped slave, back to his master, Philemon. Thus Paul *wrote* and thus he *did*, not because he was in sympathy with slavery—for we know from his letter to Philemon that he was not, since he wrote him to receive Onesimus “no longer as a servant, but more than a servant, a brother beloved—” but because he was preaching a very different gospel from that which teaches that “it is the business of the church to save the world, not to rescue souls from the world.”

There was probably as great political corruption in the Roman Empire in Paul’s day as there is in the United States to-day, yet we find the apostles saying not one word about “civic righteousness and social justice.” They did not pose as political reformers in any sense. Their commission did not authorize them to do any such work. They simply preached the gospel. They besought men to be “reconciled to God.” They taught obedience to his law and loyalty to him even in the face of death; and every one of them, excepting John, sealed his testimony with his blood; and John was banished to Patmos for his devotion to his Lord. But not one of them ever undertook to change the civic or social customs of Rome, nor of any part of it, except by teaching individuals to live righteous lives, to obey the Golden Rule, to deal justly and to do justice. Of course this had a great influence upon civic and social customs. For example, from being intolerant of Christianity Rome became tolerant, and proclaimed liberty of conscience for all. Then it was that there arose advocates of national salvation, and in their endeavors to “save the nation” by making it “Christian,” ruined it entirely by making it papal.

The world with its institutions is a sinking ship. The church should man the life-boat, not the pumps. Inspiration likens it to a burning building: “Some save, snatching them out of the fire,” says the apostle. Jude, verse 23, R. V.

The church needs not more political “reformers,” but more “fishers of men.”

B.

Make the flag stand for the right, and do not try to force right to stand by the flag.

A Distinction Without a Difference.

In endeavoring to show a necessity for Sunday laws, it is admitted that the state has no right to require Sunday rest on religious grounds; but it is held that the state can rightfully require the same thing on civil grounds. If the state made an individual stop work on Sunday because Sunday is a religious day, that would plainly be doing him a wrong; but if it required him to desist from Sunday work because rest one day in seven is a physical necessity to man’s well being, or something of that kind, that would be all right.

Precisely the same thing is required of the individual in both cases; precisely the same effect is felt by the individual. Yet we are asked to believe that in the one case he would be suffering a wrong, while in the other case there would be no wrong done to him whatever. Whether he suffered an injustice or not would be not a question of the nature of the act or its result upon him at all, but only of the *motive* by which the act was prompted! Such distinctions we confess are altogether too fine for our comprehension.

If the thing prohibited were something wrong in its very nature, as murder or theft, the case would be different. The state cannot deal with murder from a religious standpoint, that is, as a sin, but can deal with it as a crime, and as such prohibits it under the severest penalties. But honest labor cannot be classed with murder, theft, or any other act wrong in itself. Honest labor is not a thing to be prohibited as an enemy of social peace and order. It would be far more reasonable to prohibit idleness on such grounds, since idleness is known to breed disturbance and crime.

In the one case the act is wrong in itself, and is prohibited for that reason. By its prohibition no injustice can be done to anyone. In the other case—where labor on Sunday is prohibited—it is admitted that injustice is done the person who is thus restrained, if the reason for the prohibition be a religious one; and this is an acknowledgment that the act is all right in its character and may be for the benefit of the person performing it, which could not be true of anything wrong in itself. The individual suffers a hardship in being compelled to lose one-seventh of his time, which is an injustice to him on religious grounds, yet the very same hardship is no injustice at all if the reason for it is alleged upon civil grounds. Injustice becomes justice simply by alleging a civil reason for it in the place of a religious one. Verily there is something in a name, after all!

If it is wrong to interfere with personal freedom on Sunday on religious grounds—if such interference would in any case be an invasion of one’s rights—it must be an invasion of rights and an injustice no matter how many changes may be rung upon the name

under which the action is sought to be justified. The act of compelling a man to stop his work and remain idle on Sunday could not be an invasion of his rights under one name, if it were not an invasion under every name; since the act itself, and its effects upon him, remain precisely the same in every case.

The admission that it would be unjust to prohibit work on Sunday save for the alleged civil necessity for such restraint, is fatal to the attempt to justify the Sunday laws. It is a confession of their injustice.

"Anglo-Saxon Drivel."

This is the heading under which the Baltimore News of July 6 prints with brief comment the following from Bishop Charles H. Fowler, of the Methodist Episcopal Church:

"The three greatest missionary events of the Christian era since the crucifixion of Jesus are: First, the conversion of St. Paul. This opened the door to the Gentiles. This was our chance. Second, the firing on Fort Sumter. This made the great Anglo-Saxon race fit for evangelical uses. Third, the blowing up of the Maine. This unified the great Anglo-Saxon race, and sent us out about our work. It melted the American elements in the furnace of war and made all Americans one. The grandson of General Grant and the nephew of General Lee marched side by side under one flag and against a common enemy. It fused the American and English branches of this race. The errand of the united Anglo-Saxon race is to keep the world's peace. Together they police the seas and prevent the other nations from fighting. It soon will be true that not a soldier will lift his foot unless the command is given in the English language."

The News does not vouch for the correctness of this report, but says if the Bishop "is correctly reported, he has been beating the record in that preaching of 'pernicious nonsense' on Anglo-Saxonism which has been so conspicuous a feature in English and American quarters since the outbreak of our war with Spain."

"Between the conversion of St. Paul, then," says the News, "and the firing on Fort Sumter, the world's history was, from the 'missionary' point of view, comparatively a blank. The incursion of the barbarians and the conquest of Rome, the creation of the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire, Charlemagne, the Crusades, the Norman Conquest, the Protestant Reformation—all these were of no consequence in comparison with the firing on Fort Sumter and the sinking of the Maine."

It may be that the Bishop was not correctly reported, or that the connection would greatly modify that which standing alone is certainly not inaptly styled "drivel." But be this as it may, there is altogether too much of a looking away from spiritual to material things to-day on the part of the church.

Doubtless events such as those mentioned by Bishop Fowler are overruled by the Lord for the advancement of his cause; but the Bishop has certainly read history to very little purpose if he considers the firing upon Sumter and the blowing up of the Maine as worthy to be compared, in importance and in far-reaching influence, with even such a minor event in the era of the Reformation as the secession from Rome of the English Church under the leadership of Henry VIII. The discovery of America, the coming of the Pilgrims to these shores, the giving of the Declaration of Independence to the world, the adoption of the First Amendment to the Constitution were each of more importance in far-reaching influence upon the religious history of this world than either of the two events cited by Bishop Fowler since the conversion of the Apostle Paul.

B.

A Tale of Two Nations — The Monarchy of the Master.

Christ came to his own and his own received him not. He came as a prince, king, monarch. He came preaching the gospel of his kingdom.

Impatiently all his people watched him, expecting every moment that he would issue a proclamation declaring himself king, and calling upon the Jews to flock to his standard. Breathlessly they awaited the gladsome hour when he would demand their allegiance and rally their carnal weapons to the support of his claims to the headship of a universal monarchy.

But how vastly, how infinitely different, was the monarchy of the Master. To that pure and holy One the power of earthly governments was a thing to be rejected and despised. Beautifully have the feelings of the Lord upon this great theme been depicted by the late Thomas Hewlings Stockton:

"There was one sacrifice too great for Christ to make: He was willing to leave the throne of the universe for the manger of Bethlehem; willing to grow up as the son of a poor carpenter; willing to be called the friend of publicans and sinners; willing to be watched by jealous eyes, and slandered by lying tongues, and hated by murderous hearts, and betrayed by friendly hands, and denied by pledged lips, and rejected by apostate priests and deluded populace and cowardly princes; willing to be sentenced to the cross and bleed and groan. *But he was not willing to wear an earthly crown or robe, or wield an earthly sceptre, or exercise earthly rule.* That would have been too great a sacrifice! He did, indeed, endure the crown of thorns, and the cast-off purple and the reed, and the cry, 'Hail, King of the Jews!' but this was merely because he preferred the mockery to the reality; so pouring infinite contempt on the one, not only by rejecting it in the beginning of his ministry, but also by accepting the other at its close."

He came as king; he came to a race of rebels in insurrection against his rule, but he came not to

be ministered unto but to minister. Strange monarch! strange monarchy! In answer to a question from a government official named Pilate, he said, "My kingdom is not of this world: for if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight." In this one sweeping statement he renounces for himself forever the support of human power, the strength of human arms; his was to be a new kingdom, a new kind of monarchy, of a nature so different from all that had ever preceded it, so infinitely more spiritual in its distinguishing characteristics and traits, that the announcement of its policy shocked, amazed and confounded the nation of the Jews.

Had the Lord been willing to institute a government after the pattern of those of earth with Himself at its head, the Jews would everywhere have crowded to his banners. Many would have been willing to recognize him as king had he only been willing to satisfy the desires of the natural heart by offering them place and position in his kingdom. Even his disciples were not altogether free from the idea that his kingdom was an earthly one; they were not without a taint of selfishness, desiring the chief offices of state.

"Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping him and desiring a certain thing of him." "What would ye that I should do for you?" the Master asked. "Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand and the other on thy left in thy kingdom." Tenderly the Lord made answer, not even rebuking their selfishness in seeking preference above their brethren. He read their hearts; he alone knew the great depths of their attachment to him. Their love was not a mere human affection. True, it was love defiled by the earthiness of the human vessel, but it was nevertheless an overflowing from the fountain of redeeming love. "To sit on my right hand, and on my left," said the Master, "is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared by my Father."

In the kingdom of God position is not given through favoritism. It is not earned, nor is it received through an arbitrary bestowal. It is the result of character. The crown and the throne are the tokens of a condition attained through self-conquest by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. The monarchy of Christ was a monarchy gained by conquest, but it was the conquest of self and the monarchy over self. His was a monarchy over self sufficiently strong to cause him to relinquish the pomp, the splendor and the glory of heaven. His was a kingship over his own soul sufficiently potent to cause him to leave the regal palaces of the better land and to come to earth as a homeless pilgrim, without place to lay his weary head. His was a monarchy so mighty and powerful over body, soul and spirit as to cause him humbly to

serve, and cheerfully to minister unto those who of right were his own subjects but who stood in wanton uncalled-for rebellion against his government. He came to serve those who hated him, to bind up the wounds of his own sinful subjects. Tenderly to minister to those who despised and who rejected him was the supreme office of royalty in the kingdom and the monarchy of the greatest prince that the earth or heaven has ever known. Strange monarchy forsooth to men of earth, wondrous exhibition of true monarchical power to angels and beings of unfallen worlds.

So great, so mighty, so marvelous was the influence of this kind of monarchy that every angel in heaven followed the wake, and of them the pencil of the Holy Ghost has written "Are they not all *ministering* spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of heaven?" The angels of heaven come not to the earth to rule, or to exact homage, but as messengers of mercy, nor arbitrarily to force but gently to woo the hearts of fallen men and women,—rebels against the government of God,—and to seek to lead them into a closer fellowship with Christ than they themselves may ever hope to know.

P. T. MAGAN.

Reformation or Deformation.

PART I. HISTORY.

To all readers of the Sentinel it must be plain that it is impossible to legislate either genius or piety into any people. Hence all attempts by legal methods, to produce a renaissance in art or literature, or to foster religion, must inevitably fail. It may not be as clear to all why such attempts are not only useless but harmful, and that they invariably work backwards, producing not a new birth but a death, not a reformation but a deformation. This, however, is true, and that it is true, and why it is true, this paper will seek to show.

In the fourth century, it was the effort made by the church fathers to Christianize the Roman State that paganized the church, and built up the papal despotism. We may not question the sincerity of many of those men. Certainly, too, there was no lack of religious enthusiasm; for the Christian citizenship leaders of the time, in their imaginative zeal, saw visions of angels in the sky leading on the victorious armies of the Christian (?) prince. Those men were simply mistaken, and their mistake was twofold. Their method of reformation was by human law instead of by the power of the divine love. This was the first and great mistake, and the second mistake was like unto it, and inevitably followed from it,—it was that they were more anxious to Christianize the state, than to Christianize the individual. They sought to reach the individual through the state instead of the state through the individual.

All this was a complete reversal of Jesus' methods.

Jesus repudiated all legal methods and worked by the power of the divine love alone, knowing well that only that power could reach the heart. Before his penetrating gaze, all forms of human organization were as naught. He saw only the naked human soul, sinning, and so needing a Saviour. His method so succeeded as to permeate the whole heathen world with the power of redeeming faith and love. Before its triumphal progress even the mighty despotism of the Roman empire could not stand; and this the most philosophical of the emperors saw very well, and so, against their better natures, and almost against their wills, they became persecutors. But persecution could not stop the progress of Christianity; on the contrary, it was a common saying that "The blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church."

Constantine saw all this, and well knew that the progress of Christianity meant the destruction of imperial power. He determined to subvert Christianity into the use of force, and so bring it into alliance with Imperialism. To the Christians who had been persecuted for years, and many of whose leaders even then were maimed as the result, the thought of utter security and immunity from persecution by alliance with a Christian (?) state was too intoxicatingly fascinating to be resisted. So the plan of Constantine succeeded, and the Christian Citizenship movement of the fourth century began. What was the result?

As soon as the movement had progressed far enough to make it evident to the politicians and office seekers that the road to political preferment lay through the church, they all practiced looking and acting pious until they could do so successfully; and then they sought and gained admission to the church. Draper says, "A way was thus opened through the church for the *lowest men* to reach the highest office"; and the great church historian, Neander, remarks that, "All that was corrupt in the Byzantine court thus found its way into the bosom of the church." Thus the church, the representative of the only power that can purify the hearts of men and so uplift the world, was itself corrupted and its efficiency for good almost entirely destroyed. What wonder that the world darkened down into that night of a thousand years known now as the Dark Ages."

Men were taught to deny their own consciences, and the sovereignty of God over the individual soul, and to submit, in slavish fear, to the dictation of the organic church backed by the power of the allied state.

Thus repeatedly outraged, conscience ceased to manifest its power, and the voice of God in the soul was hushed. The effort to save the world by law, however sincerely made, had resulted only in ruin and utter defeat.

It were easy to produce many such illustrations

from history, showing how all efforts to produce religious reformations by law not only inevitably fail, but produce deformation and destruction instead. Men are, however, often so controlled by religious prejudices as to be unable to see clearly the force of such illustrations. Let us, therefore, seek to free ourselves from all such hampering prejudices by taking an illustration apart from religion entirely,—an illustration of the same principles as applied to literature.

The age of Louis XIV. of France has been glorified as an age of literature and of art. A perverse and short-sighted history, forgetting that we reap to-day not what we sow to-day, but instead, what we sowed yesterday and long before, has given much of the credit of this glory to Louis himself, and to his method of subsidizing literature.

A little careful study of the chronology of the time will show how great is this mistake. Whenever the attempt is made to name the men upon the success of whose work the literary and scientific glory of the age depends, invariably the names are given of Descartes, Pascal, Fermat, Gassendi, Mersenne, Pecquet, and Riolan, and perhaps also of Belon, Rondelet, and Rey. But the work of every one of these men was practically finished, and most of the men were in their graves before Louis XIV. assumed the government of France in 1661. Surely, not to anything in his administration of the Government of France can the merit of their work be due. The truth is that the half century immediately preceding the reign of Louis was one of progress and of genius. The Reformation had broken the shackles from the human mind. Everywhere men were thinking. For the first time in centuries, they were asking not only the question, How? but also the question, Why? Draper well says of this age, "On the ruins of its ivy-grown cathedrals, Ecclesiasticism, surprised and blinded by the breaking day, sat solemnly blinking at the light and life about it." Under the inspiration of this spirit of freedom and inquiry France produced men of merit in almost every department of human thought and effort. Prominent among them were the men already named,—men who added to the sum of human knowledge and left their imprint on the thought of the race. Seeing all this, Louis was vain or ambitious enough to want to get to himself some of this honor. He thought to set his crown with the stars of genius, and emblazon his name forever in a galaxy of glory. He was foolish enough to think concerning literature as many even to-day think concerning religion, that he could forward its interests by governmental methods. For fully half a century during his long reign he adopted the practice of rewarding literary men with large sums of money, and with many marks of personal favor. What was the effect of this method upon literature itself? Instead of to advance its interests,

the effect was to paralyze its power. Any government, even a monarchy, to be operative at all, must have back of it the sympathy and support of a majority of its subjects. All governments, therefore, must be conservative, while truth is ever progressive. Literature is the repository of truth, as true religion is the worship of Truth. Truth always enters the world by a minority of one, born in a manger, crucified between thieves. After a time there are two who believe in it, then three, but the journey is long and perilous before the majority opinion, or the governmental opinion is on its side. Ere then it has ceased to be the advanced truth and there are farther glimpses on the horizon of thought. Whenever, therefore, government touches religion or literature its inevitable effect must be to paralyze it. The age of Louis XIV. was no exception. After the system of subsidies inaugurated by Louis had had time to bear its fruit, France for half a century produced not one independent thinker of note. All the talent of France that could be bought was chained to the chariot wheels of state, and turned aside from progressive lines into merely decorating the old idea. There was much that was elegant and attractive, even artistic, but nothing progressive. The senses of men were soothed and satisfied by palaces, paintings and poems, but the intellect and heart were left fallow.

Even art itself, lacking the inspiration of lofty, bold, and progressive thought, soon began to decay. It was as if the sum of genius and of progress, that had arisen gloriously, and mounted grandly toward the zenith, had suddenly paused midway in the heavens, and slowly descending, had set in the east. Buckle, in his "History of Civilization", says, "In other countries vast progress was made; and Newton in particular, by his immense generalizations, reformed nearly every branch of physics, and remodeled astronomy by carrying the law of gravitation to the extremity of the solar system. On the other hand, France had fallen into such a torpor, that these wonderful discoveries which changed the face of knowledge, were entirely neglected, there being no instance of any French astronomer adopting them until 1732, that is, forty-five years after they were published by their immortal author."

"In no age have literary men been rewarded with such profusion as in the age of Louis XIV.; and in no age have they been so mean-spirited, so servile, so utterly unfit to fulfill their great vocation as the apostles of knowledge and the missionaries of truth. . . . To gain the favor of the king, they sacrificed that independent spirit which should have been dearer to them than life. They gave away the inheritance of genius; they sold their birthright for a mess of pottage." (Buckle's Hist. of Civilization, Vol. I. Pages 498 and 501.)

Such was the effect of government patronage upon literature, which it sought by its favors to benefit, but this was by no means all the evil. That money which was bestowed so lavishly upon literature, was taken by taxation from the toilers. Thus labor was degraded, and he who produced the necessities of life, was made to feel his inferiority to him who only ministered to its luxuries. Nor was even this the worst. Literature, being the representative of truth, should ever be on the side of the rights of the people, and against all despotism. It should act as a check upon the selfishness of monarchy and the corruption of republics. But by this means literature was chained to the throne and made to soothe and quiet the conscience of the king in his evil way.

Again I quote from Buckle, "It behooves, therefore, every people to take heed that the interests of literary men are on their side rather than on the side of their rulers. For literature is the representative of intellect, which is progressive; government is the representative of order, which is stationary. As long as these two are separate, they will correct and react upon each other, and the people may hold the balance. If, however, these powers coalesce, if the government can corrupt the intellect, and the intellect will yield to the government, the inevitable result must be despotism in politics, and servility in literature." * * "Then it is, that there comes one of those sad moments in which no outlet being left for public opinion, the minds of men are unable to find a vent; their discontents, having no voice, slowly rankle into a deadly hatred; their passions accumulate in silence, until at length, losing all patience, they are goaded into one of those terrible revolutions, by which they humble the pride of rulers, and carry retribution even into the heart of the palace."

Thus it is seen that this effort of Louis XIV. to advance the interests of literature by governmental methods, resulted not only in ruin to literature, but almost, also, in ruin to France, it being one of the causes of the French Revolution and of the terrible reign of terror.

People should think soberly of this warning in these days, when leading journals pass over in silence, or boldly uphold all the misdeeds of the party that may chance to be in power, and when even magazines of high literary merit are so subsidized by wealth as to publish long articles in defense of the trusts as a blessing to the people.

Such illustrations from history to prove the point in question, might easily be multiplied. The moral is, that God made the mind and heart of man free, and government, however good and pure its intentions, cannot touch them by its methods, without producing slavery, paralysis, and ruin.

G. E. FIFIELD.

NEWS, NOTES AND COMMENT

The Sunday-closing ordinance demanded by the churches of Hamburg, Ia., has been tabled by the city council by a vote of five to four. The contest will be fought to a finish in the municipal election to be held next spring. One of the ministers of the place says that the present mayor will be defeated because of his vote to table the proposed ordinance. Pending the spring election an effort will probably be made to enforce the state law.

* * *

"Christian Citizenship" must meet with some difficulties in France, since the elections there are all held on Sunday. But inasmuch as it is held by some at least of the advocates of the movement, that it is the duty of the brethren to "leave the prayer-meeting with the sisters, and attend the primaries" and "pull wires for the kingdom of God," it might easily appear that participation in an election is the highest type of Sunday observance.

* * *

Officially, Germany is one of the most religious of countries. It has Sunday laws which are strictly enforced. Christianity is recognized by the government, and its institutions are supported out of the public treasury. Religion is taught in the public schools, which all the children are required to attend, so that none is without religious instruction.

But notwithstanding the governmental support given to religion in Germany, the larger towns of that country "have a smaller number of churches," says Dr. Stocker, "in proportion to the population than those of any other country in Christendom." This is a fact that everybody, especially those who find themselves inclined to trust in legislative acts to reform society, save the nation, or revive religion, would do well to consider carefully.

* * *

The American Israelite complains that "in Roumania, where religious liberty and political equality were pledged by its government as a condition of the guarantee of Roumanian independence by the treaty of the Powers, the Jew is deprived of citizenship; he is excluded from all occupations but the most menial, his children are not admitted to the public schools, and his life, limbs and property are at all times at the mercy of Christian mobs, who frequently avail

themselves of their power, which their priests teach them is part of the reward from heaven for fidelity to the church." After so citing the facts, the "Israelite" asks, "Is there anything worse than this among the Confucians?"

Certainly not; but it makes a great difference whose ox is gored. Besides written guarantees of rights either civil or religious are worthless if not supported by enlightened, liberal public sentiment. In no country in the world can more ample guarantees of religious liberty be found than in the United States and yet there is scarcely a State in the Union that does not have upon its statute books and in its court reports laws and decisions trenching upon liberty of conscience. The ideal has not yet been attained and just now the forces of bigotry not only in this country but everywhere seem not only to have effectually scotched the wheels of progress, but to have turned them backward.

* * *

"A Christian church," says the Social Forum, "must have for its paramount aim 'a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness,' the reign of brotherhood."

The church has nothing whatever to do, in this sense, with "a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." It is true the Scriptures promise such an earth, but the church has no more to do with preparing it than Noah had to do with bringing forth from the waters of the flood the earth that now is. The work of the church is to so represent God to men that they will become candidates for the new earth; but that earth instead of being, as the Social Forum implies, merely a more perfect social state of existence, will be just as real, just as physical as the earth that now is. No one who will read and believe the second chapter of second Peter will have the least trouble over this subject.

* * *

Republican vice-presidential candidate, Governor Roosevelt, is credited in the newspaper reports of his St. Paul speech, with these words:

"Read the notes issued by Von Bulow, speaking for Germany, and John Hay, speaking for ourselves, and see how absolutely alike are the policies therein outlined. We are taking the only course consistent with our national self-interest and our national self-respect, and, above all, with the good of mankind at large."

This was said concerning the Chinese embroglio, but is not likely to be generally accepted as reassuring by the American people. Mr. Hay is probably acting wisely in insisting that the United States are not at war with China; and possibly so in insisting that the President has ample power to deal with the present situation without consulting Congress; but the fact

that his utterances upon any subject are so very similar to those of the German chancellor will not commend them to a self-governing people. The fact that without any very critical examination any one can "see how absolutely alike are the policies" of the American and European governments is one of the most alarming features of the times. The United States are becoming too much "like all the nations" in many respects.

* * *

At the dedication of the site of Dr. Dowie's "Zion City," six miles north of Waukegan on the shore of Lake Michigan, July 14, the Doctor is reported to have said: "God made the world, and he made it for his people. They only have a right to it. The rule of a country 'by the people, for the people,' is not a good thing. The right form of government is the rule of all things by God and for God."

Such sentiments are not original with Dr. Dowie. From time to time men have arisen who have first claimed the earth for the Lord, and then for themselves as the Lord's representatives. The trouble begins when they attempt to take possession. However, there are no indications that Dr. Dowie and his followers contemplate any illegal acts.

But the sentiment expressed by the Doctor is no less mischievous because it is not likely to lead to overt acts of lawlessness. The assumption of a right to rule in God's name and for him, is much more to be feared than would be any overt act. The self-appointed trustee of God is always an embezzler of the rights of men, and there are entirely too many such trustees doing business for the Lord (?) now.

It is true that "the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof," but for the time being he has "given it to the children of men." Therefore "government of the people, by the people and for the people" is a good thing. It is just the way the world ought to be governed, and such government has always been immeasurably better, when it was such indeed, than any government ever established and administered by self-appointed trustees of God.

* * *

Dr. Dowie and his "Zion" movement are not to be feared, but every advocate of the dangerous doctrine espoused by the Doctor and his disciples, namely, that the "right form of government is the rule of all things by God and for God," adds to the forces that are slowly, it may be true, but none the less surely undermining popular liberty in this land. For in practice such pretended government is only some man or some set of men exercising usurped authority, not indeed for God but for themselves, in His name. We are plainly told in the Scriptures (Ezek.

21:25-27) that with the passing away of the Jewish theocracy such rule was to cease from the earth to "be no more until He come whose right it is," when it will be given "to Him." And it will be given to Him, not by any man nor by any set of men, but by the Father himself, as declared in the second psalm.

This particular feature of Dowism is only one manifestation of theocratic theory of civil government whose advocates under myriad names are steadily drawing together, and who will ere long make mischief in this country, and in the world.

* * *

A Cuban correspondent of the Catholic Standard and Times, writing from Havana under date of July 9, says of the operations of Protestants in the island:

"Inasmuch as Cubans are, almost without exception, baptized Catholics, those missionaries, in so far as their work is among the Cubans, cannot be looked upon other than as proselytizers, and, therefore, with disfavor; but I have been following their work since the first days of the American occupation, and do not think there is really cause on the part of the Catholics for any particular anxiety on the subject."

The public schools, this correspondent thinks, will entirely supplant the denominational schools now maintained by several different Protestant churches. He says:

"I am happy to think, however, that many of those children will enter the public school next fall which has been organized since the missionaries began their labors; and while no religious instruction will be allowed in those schools, they will be taught by Catholics who will not poison the minds of their pupils with error, and, eventually, when the Cubans regain their mental equilibrium, which has been considerably perturbed by passing revolutions, I hope to see religious instruction made a part of the public school curriculum."

The conclusion of the Times' correspondent is that "considerable money will be spent by our proselytizing friends at the expense of their home supporters, with little result save that of furnishing employment to hungry ministers. The harm they will do will be trifling compared to the genuine progress which their tactics will produce in the Catholic Church of the island."

* * *

Sunday Reform Leaflets for April advocates a "civil Sabbath" because "distinguished economists say that men who have only six days' work do better work and more of it than those who work seven days;" and a religious Sabbath because "popular merrymaking on the Lord's day is usually a very accurate gauge of popular vice. The distinguished French infidel, Proudhon, speaking of France, says: 'Sunday in the towns is a day of rest without motive or end; an occa-

sion of display for the women and children, of consumption in the restaurants and wine shops, of degrading idleness, of surfeit and debauchery.'"

This is simply logical despotism. First, the government compels the people to rest for their health and material prosperity. But as in this their morals suffer, they must be compelled also to be religious to prevent their becoming debased. Thus we have in two easy steps, complete justification (?) of despotism for the good of the dear people.

Again, it is said that every government has the inherent right to perpetuate itself. Stable government, especially in a republic, is dependent in large measure upon a vigorous and virtuous people. But vigor can be maintained only by proper physical conditions, and virtue only by religion; therefore, for its own preservation the government must see to it that the people do not become enervated by unremitting toil, nor debased by atheism or by false religion. Thus again we have in two easy and perfectly logical steps, complete justification (?) of despotism in the interests of stable government.

Sunday Bicycle Racing in New England.

A mass meeting was held recently at Hills Grove, Mass., to protest against Sunday bicycle races on the race track at that place. There was a "large attendance from the village and surrounding country." Addresses were made in which Sunday racing was severely condemned as being "demoralizing to the young people of the community and the surrounding villages." It was further declared to be a "public nuisance." By a nearly unanimous vote of the assembly it was resolved that further Sunday racing should not be permitted, and it was further provided that a committee should be appointed to secure signatures to a petition to the owner of the track and to the town council, requesting that Sunday racing be prohibited.

Why then is racing on Sunday demoralizing and racing on Monday or Saturday or the Fourth of July or Labor Day not demoralizing? What is the basis of the discrimination between Sunday and these other days? What can that basis be other than the difference in the nature of Sunday and these other days, Sunday being a religious day and the others secular days? What other difference is there between Sunday and other days of the week?

Sunday races are therefore held to be demoralizing and a public nuisance because Sunday is a religious day. They are to be prohibited because Sunday is a religious day. Legislation prohibiting them is to be based upon the religious character of the day. The legislative power is to be exercised in favor of that religion which holds that Sunday is a sacred day. Some religions hold the seventh day to be sacred, and

not the first; the civil authority is to discriminate between religions.

Why should the civil authority discriminate between religions? If that is proper now, why was it not always proper? and if it is proper in America, why is it not proper in China? A principle is the same in all lands, and the principle that will justify legislative action on religious grounds in the United States, will justify it in every other country in the world. And the principle which condemns connivance between civil government and religion in China or Turkey, condemns it in the United States.

The racing complained of may or may not be demoralizing; but there can be no more reason for prohibiting racing on one day of the week than on another. Legislative discrimination between religions is, however, demoralizing in the extreme. There is nothing that weakens morals quicker or more surely than state support of religion. In escaping a fancied evil, the people of this New England town are in danger of running into a real evil than which no greater can threaten their religious and political prosperity.

S.

The "Index Expurgatorius" for Public Libraries and Public Schools.

At a recent convention in Philadelphia of the Knights of St. John the appointment of committees was advocated "whose most important function should be to see that all books of an anti-Catholic character are kept out of the public libraries and public schools."

The writer is not in favor of virulent attacks upon Catholics or any other class of people, but the wisdom or effectiveness of this policy toward even such attacks, is open to very serious question. Books which are unjust and which misrepresent and distort the truth, are their own best negatives, and the man who cares only for the truth can afford to let them defeat themselves. It is to be feared that the move here contemplated would not end simply with the exclusion of books of this kind. This proposed "index expurgatorius" for public libraries and public schools would no doubt, in its exclusion of "all books of an anti-Catholic character," place the ban upon many books in which are faithfully recorded the facts of history. Any reference to those acts of bigotry and intolerance which have stained with the blood of martyrs the fairest portions of the Old World, would, of course, be sufficient to secure the condemnation of the book in which it was found.

By no means the least of the tyrannies and oppressions of which many books tell us, was the suppression and burning of books which were deemed dangerous by those who placed the interests of the church above the interests of truth and human liberty.

Will such books be allowed to remain? Clearly not; it follows, therefore, that the greater part of the history of Europe—from the fourth to almost the nineteenth century—would be excluded, or at least so colored and falsified as to be utterly misleading. Even the writings of the apostle John himself, after whom this society is named, could scarcely escape. Here are quotations from books that he wrote: "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world but to save the world." "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword." These and many other great truths equally plain contained in the books of which John was the writer, would be sufficient, we fear, to place them among "books of an anti-Catholic character."

It is chiefly to books that we must go to learn of the direful and woful results in all ages of the efforts of civil and ecclesiastical powers to crush all opinion declared "anti" by them. With such books our libraries abound, and they will be left incomplete indeed if this policy is carried out. If Catholics may exclude from the libraries and schools what they deem inimical to the interests of the church, why may not other religionists and classes of people do the same with reference to books that they consider against their interests? It is plainly evident that if this policy were to begin libraries would no longer be entitled to the name and would soon become a thing of the past. Books would again become as scarce and as difficult of access for the people as they were when the Waldensian and Vandois was obliged to carry his precious manuscripts to the people concealed in the peddler's pack, and when Luther during the hours of the night pored over the Bible chained to the convent walls of Erfurt.

The public libraries and public schools are for the whole people, not for one class of people. They exist not to antagonize any class or any religion, and they must not be made to favor any class or any religion. Were it not that special religious interests have and are being given in this country almost anything they demand, we could not take seriously this proposed action of the Knights of St. John; for we are utterly unable to understand how anyone who has intelligence enough to advocate anything and who has the slightest conception of what public schools and libraries are for, should expect them to be conducted with especial and exclusive consideration for him and his religion; for that is what this demand amounts to.

He who cares but for the truth and hopes that right alone shall prevail, will not resort to such weak and questionable measures. He will rest assured that books that are unjust will prove to every candid mind their unfairness; and he will not fear those books in which are faithfully recorded the facts of history.

Some of those facts may be against him or the body to which he belongs. He will prize them the more highly for that very reason, because they will be his greatest aids and surest guides in making it impossible for any such facts ever again to be registered against him.

Let there be no return to the methods of the Dark Ages in dealing with opponents in the field of discussion. Let us not maintain ourselves and our opinions by shutting from men the facts and information to which they are entitled and must have in forming correct opinions, nor by crushing opinions which have not been formed in accordance with our own. Let us be more anxious to see and know that we ourselves are right, than to suppress those whom we deem to be wrong.

JOHN D. BRADLEY.

World-Storm Brewing.

(The Chicago Daily News, July 17.)

While the fall of Tientsin and the report that the legations at Peking are still alive have lightened the gloom of the Chinese situation temporarily, there are other considerations in the background that are weighty and fraught possibly with grave peril. The spectacle of Europe, America and Japan arrayed together in the orient on the side of advanced civilization is in itself inspiring. Nothing like it has been seen in all the history of the world. The nearest approach to the present situation is to be found in the crusades, when the knights and paladins of Europe led western nations against the infidels of the east in an attempt to gain possession of the holy sepulchre.

But granting that the allies, as they are somewhat loosely called, capture Peking, what then? It is probable that this would be only the beginning of a greater struggle whose storm area may involve the entire world. It has been no secret for several years that the European powers have planned the partition of China. By one of the uncalculated chances that partition is no longer possible on the old basis. At that time America had not yet been drawn into even the outer edge of the slowly revolving forces which have now caught up practically all the nations of the world in their mighty grasp. America even yet stands for a different principle and policy in China from that of the powers. While Russia, England, Germany and France and possibly other European nations, together with Japan, have accustomed themselves to view as a matter of business and as inevitable the partition of China, America, already with all the territory it wants, stands for Chinese integrity and the fulfillment of present treaty rights as being of greatest advantage and benefit to her. It requires little knowledge of diplomacy to see that even were a new congress of nations called to consider the question of Chinese par-

tition there would be little prospect of reaching a harmonious conclusion. In that case war would result and it might readily involve not only the so-called allies but the Chinese themselves in a struggle whose consequences no one can foresee.

Official Sanction for "Empire."

There is no longer any ground for fault finding with the charge that the United States has through its expansion policy become an empire; the Government itself acknowledges the fact, or at least it is acknowledged by those who speak for the Government, according to the following circular which has been issued in the Philippines:—

"U. S. Military Government in the Philippines,
"Department Public Instruction.

"A Department of Public Instruction for the Philippines has just been established, and I write to ask if you can aid us in the civilization of this new part of our Empire by sending such reports, bulletins, school laws, etc., now or to be issued as you may have for distribution."

A Catholic journal calls attention to this circular as containing "the first official use of the word 'empire' in connection with the United States," this being "a fact which historians might find it useful to note." Certainly it is time that the term "empire," referring to this nation, should make its appearance under official sanction.

Christ's Victory Not So Local.

At the conclusion of an excellent illustrated temperance lecture in this city recently, a clergyman was invited to offer prayer. After praying earnestly against the liquor curse, and seeking the blessing of heaven to rest upon the earnest man so nobly defending the righteous cause of temperance, purity and happiness, he brought in the following sentiment: "Descend, O Christ, and bear aloft to the skies the star spangled banner of victory, the devil and all his host notwithstanding."

Such careless expressions may seem harmless, but in them are lurking fatal seeds. Jesus Christ never will descend to bear away from this sin-polluted earth any emblem of any nation. When he comes, he comes as "King of kings, and Lord of lords." Every earthly power in that awful day shall crumble to dust. In the day of his setting up his kingdom "which shall never be destroyed," "the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it [Christ's kingdom] shall break in pieces and consume ALL these [earthly] kingdoms, and it [his heavenly] shall stand forever." Dan. 2:44.

While our flag may stand for principles of liberty and righteousness in advance of some other nations, it does not stand for *all* that is righteousness and truth.

All must acknowledge this. It does not follow that because our flag represents *some* advance principles that Christ will seize its staff and finish purifying the earth under its folds and then hoist it over his throne to float forever. Such sentiments are both unscriptural and absurd.

This expression about the flag, remember, was made at the close of a *temperance* lecture in the *United States*. The connection at once is wonderfully broken by the reported piece of news from the Philippine Islands stating that when the Filipino children play American, they "stagger as though drunk."

Jesus Christ will have a pure and clean kingdom in righteousness, in which *nothing* shall enter that defiles or offends, and upon his banner will be emblazoned the words for which on earth he fought the spiritual battle unto the death, "God's everlasting LAW is the TRUTH."

T. E. BOWEN.

Rome, N. Y.

A Missionary's View of the Chinese Question.

In an interview with a representative of the Daily News (Denver, Col.), Rev. Thomas Marshall, an missionary to China, and now connected with the Board of Foreign Missions, spoke as follows in defense of the Chinese Boxers from a political standpoint:

"To intelligently study the situation in China one must understand that there are two factors—the religious or missionary and the political. These two factors must not be confused, for to my mind the Chinese are politically right but religiously wrong. Every question, on account of prejudice, must be discussed politically first.

"The aggressions made by the European powers amount to little less than piracy. Russia, as all know, has taken Port Arthur, the greatest navy yard that the Chinese possess. England has seized the land opposite. France has appropriated Yun Nan and Germany has gobbled up Kiao Chou. There is much talk of 'the sphere of influence,' but the fair mind cannot help but see that the European powers are working on the principle that might makes right. When the Chinese saw that their land was being parceled out little by little to these foreigners, they rebelled and strove to drive the invaders from their country. Suppose that the French should seize New Orleans, the English Fortress Monroe, the Russians New York and the Germans Boston, what would the American be called who tried to push back the aggressing foreigners? He would be called a patriot, and win honor and distinction. The Boxers, who are striving to do the same thing are the Chinese patriots, who say, the Germans, French and the rest are robbing us, and cannot remain in our land.

"There is much misunderstanding concerning the Boxers. The Boxers are mostly common people, and in their simplicity they have just awakened to the fact that their land has been taken from them. It is true

that they have been called the 'Long Knife Society,' and make it their law to demand that the foreigner leave China or die; but what would we Americans do under similar circumstances? It must also be remembered that the Chinese are very superstitious. They have had no rain for some time, and their religion teaches them to think that it is because the gods are displeased at the foreigners' presence.

"It is in this connection that they associate the missionaries and the Chinese Christians. In disturbing them they disturb their best friends, but their irrational action has been brought to a focus by foreign disputes as to whether China should be divided. * * *

"The only way to settle this serious question will be a very difficult one. No matter what complications it would cause, the different powers should give back the land they have taken, and I believe that the entire trouble would cease."

Quoting from a Supreme Court decision, an advocate of Sunday laws says that "laws setting aside Sunday as a day of rest are upheld, not from any right of the government to legislate for the promotion of religious observances, but from its right to protect all persons from the physical and moral debasement that comes from uninterrupted labor." If this is so, why are such laws turned against those who regularly rest on the seventh day of the week? They are not the victims of "uninterrupted labor," hence whatever physical and moral debasement there may be from such a source cannot exist in their cases; nor does the law aim, in any case, to protect people who work on Sunday from becoming physically and morally debased. It aims to protect the first day of the week against desecration, and for this reason it prohibits all persons from working on that day or from conducting themselves in any other way not in harmony with the idea that Sunday is a sacred day. The Sunday laws are designed to protect an institution rather than to protect the people. The whole history of the working of such laws shows that the debasement alleged to result from uninterrupted work cuts no figure at all in connection with their enforcement, save as a theory by which to seek their justification.

In answering, in the Sabbath Recorder, the question, "Why did God permit sin?" W. D. Tickner says: "He knew that voluntary service was the only service that could accomplish the purposes of man's being. Inanimate nature obeys his commands by virtue of the laws inherent within it. Fire and water, cold and heat, light and darkness, were subservient to him, but without volition. They reflected simply his power and majesty. He desired more, a service of love, a service willingly rendered, even amid surroundings that made such service difficult.

"To have excluded the devil from the world, would

have been to allow man a knowledge of only one side of the great controversy between good and evil, between God and Satan. Obedience to the commands of God would, under such conditions, be of little value. Man was therefore allowed to see for himself both good and evil, and for himself to decide whom he would serve. Such service was what God desired. Such service alone could accomplish the object sought in the creation and development of man."

The most wonderful thing of our day is that we do not seem to be able to learn anything from church history as to the real conditions of spiritual conquest. The government is one thing, the gospel is another. We are to obey government, but not to expect it to do the work of the gospel. We only confuse the mind by mixing things.

I do not hesitate to say that Christianity to-day is weak in the Orient because it is so inextricably mixed in the minds of the heathen with so many flags. This is not the fault of individual missionaries, but is a result of the prevailing thought that calls nations "Christian." When Christianity owned no flag it conquered. * * Do not mix Christianity with your nationalism in your expectation for spiritual religion. The whole church is weak just here to-day.

I am aware this position is not understood. It is thought to lack in patriotism and to lack in hope. But circumstances are now fast shaping themselves to confirm the non-resistant position of the early church, and to show that we may have a Christianity in name which is after all only a part of this world and wielding only this world's power.—Rev. Addison Blanchard (Denver, Col.).

The chimera of saving men "by nations" is due in large measure to the unscriptural idea that the gospel, instead of gathering out of the world a people for the everlasting kingdom of God, is finally to convert the whole world. Nowhere in all the Word of God is any such doctrine taught. On the contrary, we are plainly told (Matt. 24:37-39) that the last days will be like the days of Noah. Gen. 6:5 tells us what the moral condition of the earth was in "the days that before the flood." Moreover the Apostle Paul says definitely and explicitly (2 Tim. 3:1-5, *qv.*) that the last days of this world's history will be perilous, and this for the reason that the church—those "having a form of godliness"—will be practicing all manner of sins, seventeen of which he enumerates.

If Christians would be in the lead in human affairs, they must lead as Christians and not as politicians.

Our New Publications

Christian Patriotism

A study of the principles that should govern the true Christian patriot in his relation to earthly governments. 104 pages. Paper, 15 cents; cloth, 40 cents

The Glad Tidings

A verse-by-verse study of the book of Galatians. By DR. E. J. WAGGONER
265 pages. Paper, 25 cents; cloth, 60 cents
Also published by the Review and Herald

House We Live In

A book designed to assist mothers in teaching their children how to care for their bodies
By MRS. VESTA J. FARNSWORTH. 218 pages. Cloth, 75 cents

Marshaling of the Nations

How the five great nations of the world—Britain, Russia, United States, Germany and France—are fulfilling prophecy. Illustrated by a special series of maps. Price, 10 cents

Testimonies on Sabbath-School Work

A compilation of the writings of MRS. E. G. WHITE on Sabbath-School Work
128 pages. Cloth, 25 cents; limp leather, 35 cents

Why Are You Not a Christian

An earnest appeal to those who are out of Christ. By W. N. GLENN
8 pages. Price, 50 cents per 100

Labor and the Money Power

An intensely interesting description of the present relation of capital and labor from a prophetic standpoint. By GEO. W. RINE, B. L. 32 pages. Illustrated. \$2.00 per 100

An Astronomer's View of Our Father's House

An account of an imaginary journey among the heavenly bodies. By a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society. 24 pages. Illustrated. \$1.50 per 100

Pacific Press Publishing Co.

OAKLAND, CAL. 39 Bond Street, New York City
18 West Fifth Street, Kansas City, Missouri

THE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY LIBRARY

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

The International Religious Liberty Association.

The following numbers are now ready:

No. 1.

THE LEGAL SUNDAY.

This is one of the most faithful and interesting histories of the "American Sabbath" ever written.

256 pages. Enameled Covers. Price 25 cents.

No. 2.

Is Religious Liberty Imperiled by Sunday Laws?

The best thing on this subject ever printed.

Twelve pages. Price 1 cent.

No. 3.

THE NATIONAL W. C. T. U. CONVENTION.

Seattle, Wash., Oct. 25, 1899.

Report of Religious Liberty discussion, with prefatory note and conclusion by Mrs. S. M. I. Henry, National W. C. T. U. Evangelist; together with other matter bearing upon the question at issue, all selected, approved and arranged by Mrs. Henry.

Thirty pages. Price 2 cents.

No. 4.

THE PRESENT CRISIS AND OUR DUTY.

A most timely treatise on a live topic.

Thirty-six pages. Price 2¼ cents.

No. 5.

The National Government and Religion.

A sixteen page tract containing both the Congressional Sunday mail reports quoted in AMERICAN STATE PAPERS. These reports have never been printed before in cheap form.

Price 1 cent.

No. 6.

Primary Principles Distinguishing Between the Spheres of the State and Religion.

Nothing better has ever been written on this subject.

Fourteen pages. Price 1 cent.

No. 7.

THE CONFLICT OF THE AGES.

By GEORGE E. FIFIELD.

An excellent tract.

Fourteen Pages. Price 1 cent.

Address,

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION,

324 Dearborn Street,

CHICAGO, ILL.



CHICAGO, JULY 26, 1900.

Any one receiving The Sentinel of Liberty without having ordered it, may know that it is sent by some friend. Those who have not ordered The Sentinel need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

It is as true in the life of a nation as in that of an individual, that one wrong step leads to another. The nation, no more than the individual, can count upon or foresee the influences by which it will be led along the inviting pathway of error into which it has been tempted; it cannot foresee the unexpected circumstances which will arise and compel the setting aside of its original intentions one after the other. The downward pathway is "paved with good intentions," which are abandoned continually under the influence of a power that leads the individual on and on, to an end he did not foresee or dream of at the start. And thus of a nation: A republic never professes an intention of changing into an empire, or even holds such an intention at the start; but while its professions and intentions may be perfectly sincere, it finds itself moved by "destiny" in a course altogether at variance with them. We must judge from the nature of the step itself, rather than from the professions made in taking it, what the results will be that will follow.

Among the restrictions placed upon the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii is this: "Nor shall any public money be appropriated for the support or benefit of any sectarian, denominational, or private school, or any school not under the exclusive control of the government." It remains to be seen how this will be evaded. It seems plain, but it is no more so than are constitutional provisions that many people demand shall be overridden in the interests of governmental religion.

In commenting upon the fact that observers of the seventh day are not infrequently singled out for prosecution for Sunday work, while others are not molested, a Cincinnati paper says:

"Macaulay says that bear-baiting was interdicted by the Puritans, not because it was cruel to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the people. In the same way Sunday labor is prohibited, not so much

because it is wrong, but because the law against it is violated in a heterodoxical way. It is only those who acknowledge the binding character of the orthodox Sunday who are permitted to infringe upon it with impunity. It is by having absolute faith in the sanctity of the first day Sabbath that true believers can secure immunity when guilty of its infraction."

There is altogether too much truth in this statement. It is not so much the fact that work is done on Sunday that hurts, as it is the fact that when done by observers of the seventh day, it is in the nature of a denial of the sacredness of the day. Not that it is so intended, for Sabbatarians work on Sunday just as naturally as Sunday-keepers work on Monday, but it is necessarily so in the very nature of the case. It cannot be otherwise.

So grave a situation as the Chinese embroglio has not confronted civilization since the fall of Constantinople and the Turkish invasion of Europe. The population of the Chinese empire is not definitely known, but is variously estimated at from 380,000,000 to 400,000,000, with a territorial area of 4,200,000 square miles.

The leading nations of the earth, the United States, Great Britain (not including India), Austria, France, Germany, Japan, and Russia, exceed the highest estimate of the population of China by only 15,000,000. This excess of population would be overcome many-fold, other things being equal, by the fact that in case any or all of the great powers declare war against China, the Chinese would fight in their own territory and close to their base of supplies, while the allied powers would be compelled to transport both men and supplies thousands of miles, mostly by water. But other things are not equal, so that the result of a war wherein the world would be arrayed against China cannot be considered doubtful.

But, the Chronicle of this city remarks, "the time of peril [to civilization] is not now, nor is the danger from the Mongolians. The menace to the peace of the world will be felt when China shall have been conquered—when the division of the spoils begins. There are already signs of a 'flocking together' among the powers. The line of cleavage is partly visible."

Then follows the statement that from present indications it seems likely that Russia, France, and Germany would stand together; while common interest would naturally place England, the United States, and Japan on the other side. "If these contending forces should come to blows," says the Chronicle, "there would indeed be a Titanic struggle."

The Sunday law of Massachusetts has been amended so as to allow the sale of cigars on Sunday, though not the opening of tobacco shops.